



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/068,318 | 02/05/2002 | Wojciech J. Wyzga | 56712.00002 | 8835 |

7590

07/13/2004

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
Two Renaissance Square
Suite 2700
40 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4498

EXAMINER

SANTOS, PATRICK J D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

2

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/068,318

Applicant(s)

WYZGA ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick J Santos

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 12-14, 20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the publication, “The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network AI System (FAIS) – Identifying Potential Money Laundering Reports of Large Cash Transactions” by Senator et al. published by the American Association for Artificial Intelligence, 1995 (hereafter Senator ‘95).

Claim 1:

Regarding Claim 1, Senator ‘95 discloses: a method for retrieving law enforcement data from one or more legacy databases (Senator ‘95: Abstract) comprising:

- forming a law enforcement database by migrating data from one or more legacy databases and storing the results in a one or more tables (Senator ‘95: p. 21, col. 2. lns. 2-5; p. 26, col. 26, lns. 11-27 - note data feeds from banks read on migrating data from one or more legacy databases; additionally note the data-load programs consolidate subjects and accounts);
- receiving a search query containing one or more search terms related to a law enforcement at a web server coupled to the law enforcement database (Senator ‘95: p. 27

col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface"); and

- retrieving data matching at least one or more; of the search terms from the law enforcement database based on the search query (Senator '95: p. 27 col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface").

Claims 2, 4, and 6:

Regarding Claims 2, 4, and 6, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 (supra).

Additionally, Senator '95 discloses:

- (Claim 2) wherein the step of forming a law enforcement database further comprising storing the data along with the association between the data in a detect table (Senator '95: p. 26, col. 2, ln. 50 to p. 27, col. 2, ln. 9 - note the interpretation of a group of transactions into a pattern reads on associations of data i.e. storage into a detect table).
- (Claim 4) wherein the search query is based on a person, location, vehicle, property or incident (Senator '95: p. 29, col. 2, ln. 12 to p. 30, col. 1, ln. 31 - note query is based on persons, property e.g. money, or incident e.g. suspiciousness threshold exceeded).
- (Claim 6) wherein the step of forming a law enforcement database further comprises using a migration server to extract information from the legacy database and to populate the one or more tables using the extracted information and a format file (Senator '95: p. 30, col. 2, ln. 50 to p. 31, col. 1, ln. 12 - note that the database is separated from other application modules, including the loader i.e. the loader reads on a migration server).

Regarding Claim 6, Examiner refers to the publication, "Restructuring Databases for Knowledge Discovery by Consolidation and Link Formation," by Goldberg et al. published from

Art Unit: 2171

the Proceedings of the First International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 1995 (hereafter Goldberg '95) and the publication, "Commands Reference Manual for SYBASE SQL SERVER (TM) for UNIX", published by SYBASE CORPORATION (TM), 1992 (hereafter Sybase '92) as per MPEP 2131.01, in order to show limitations of Claim 6 are inherent in Senator '95.

- Goldberg '95 further describes the data consolidation function of FAIS. Goldberg '95 reports the FAIS loader functionality reads in disparate data (Goldberg '95: pp. 3-4, Section titled, "Consolidation in FAIS"; p. 3, Section titled, "Multiple Data Reporters").
- Senator '95 discloses that the database platform used for FAIS was SYBASE SQL SERVER (TM) (Senator '95: col. 2, Section titled, "Architecture"). Sybase '92 discloses use of format files for loading data (Sybase '92: pp. 4-3 – note that bcp (i.e. "bulkcopy") is the SYBASE SQL SERVER (TM) loader, and that it has a -f flag to specify a format file.)

Claims 3 and 5:

Regarding Claims 3 and 5, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 2 (supra).

Additionally, Senator '95 discloses:

- (Claim 3) wherein the step of storing the data further comprising storing the data along with the association between the data in the one or more tables (Senator '95: p. 26, col. 2, ln. 50 to p. 27, col. 2, ln. 9 - note that data with "high suspiciousness scores are reported to the analysts for further investigation" i.e. the data is bundled with the association);

- (Claim 5) wherein the search query is based on a person, location, vehicle, property or incident associated with one or more other person, location, vehicle, property or incident (Senator '95: p. 29, col. 2, ln. 12 to p. 30, col. 1, ln. 31 - note query is based on incident where the suspiciousness threshold is exceeded i.e. from a pattern of multiple data sets each representing an incident e.g. a large suspicious money transaction).

Claim 12:

Regarding Claim 12, Senator '95 discloses: an integrated police database search system (Senator '95: Abstract) comprising:

- a law enforcement database formed by migrating existing data from one or more pre-existing databases (Senator '95: p. 21, col. 2, lns. 2-5; p. 26, col. 26, lns. 11-27 - note data feeds from banks read on migrating data from one or more legacy databases; additionally note the data-load programs consolidate subjects and accounts);
- a server coupled to the law enforcement database, the server operable to receive search requests having one or more law enforcement search terms, the server operable to parse the search request and to retrieve data matching at least one or more of the search terms, the server further operable to send the data back to a user (Senator '95: p. 27 col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface").

Claims 13-14, 20, and 22-23:

Regarding Claims 13-14, 20, and 22, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 12 (supra). Additionally, Senator '95 discloses:

- (Claim 13) wherein the legacy database comprises databases from one or more different law enforcement jurisdictions (Senator '96: p. 21, col. 1, ln. 25 to col. 2, ln. 2 - note federal, state, and local law enforcement jurisdictions).
- (Claim 14) wherein the legacy database comprises databases from one or more database structures that are incompatible (Senator '95: p. 26, col. 2, lns. 11-27 – also see discussion regarding Claim 6 (supra)).
- (Claim 20) wherein a connect view in the database is operable to receive a search query and returning data related to one or more search terms in the search query (Senator '95: p. 30, col. 2, lns. 17-49 - note Link analysis reads on a Connect view).
- (Claim 22) further comprising a migration server operable to extract information from the one or more pre-existing databases (Senator '95: p. 30, col. 2, ln. 50 to p. 31, col. 1, ln. 12 - note that the database is separated from other application modules, including the loader i.e. the loader reads on a migration server).
- (Claim 23) wherein the migration server (Senator '95: p. 30, col. 2, ln. 50 to p. 31, col. 1, ln. 12 - note that the database is separated from other application modules, including the loader i.e. the loader reads on a migration server) receives information from a format file to assist in the population of the law enforcement database (Senator '95: col. 2, Section titled, "Architecture" – see discussion in Claim 6 regarding SYBASE SQL SERVER (TM) bcp format files).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-11, 15-19, 21, 24-25, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Senator '95 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,563,800 issued to Salo et al. (hereafter Salo '800).

Claim 7:

Regarding Claim 7, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 6 (supra). Additionally, Senator '95 discloses the use of a format file (Senator '95: col. 2, Section titled, "Architecture" – see discussion in Claim 6 regarding SYBASE SQL SERVER (TM) bcp format files). However, Senator '95 does not explicitly disclose wherein the format file is an extensible markup language file.

Salo '800 discloses a data center for providing subscriber access to data maintained on an enterprise network. Specifically, Salo '800 discloses an XML format file (Salo '800: col. 7, lns. 19-25).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the data center of Salo '800 to the FAIS system of Senator '95. The motivation to combine is suggested by Salo '800, which discloses that the data center is a particularly secure means of centralized queries as required by a law enforcement database such as the FAIS of Senator '95 (Salo '800: col. 3, lns. 25-33).

Claim 8:

Regarding Claim 8, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 1 (supra).

However, Senator '95 does not explicitly disclose wherein the step of receiving a search query further comprising receiving a search query from a client computer coupled to the web server.

Salo '800 discloses wherein the step of receiving a search query further comprising receiving a search query from a client computer coupled to the web server (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 49-61).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the data center of Salo '800 to the FAIS system of Senator '95. The motivation to combine is on the same basis as Claim 7 (supra).

Claims 9-11:

Regarding Claims 9-11, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose all the limitations of Claim 8 (supra). Additionally, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose:

- (Claim 9) wherein the step of receiving a search query from a client computer further comprises receiving a search query from a client computer coupled to the web server via an Internet connection (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 44-53; col. 5, ln. 65).
- (Claim 10) further comprising sending the data matching at least one or more search terms to the client computer (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 55-60).
- (Claim 11) wherein the step of receiving a search query further comprises receiving an encrypted search query from a client computer coupled to the web server (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 60-63 - note IPSec reads on data encryption).

Claims 15-17, and 19:

Regarding Claims 15-17, and 19, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 12 (supra). However, Senator '95 does not explicitly disclose:

- (Claim 15) wherein the server is a web server.
- (Claim 16) further comprising a plurality of servlets running on the server to provide data encryption.
- (Claim 17) wherein the server is accessible by one or more client computers coupled to the server.
- (Claim 19) wherein the database further comprises a detect view operable to receive a search query and return information associated with the data retrieved by the search request.

Salo '800 discloses:

- (Claim 15) wherein the server is a web server (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 49-51).
- (Claim 16) further comprising a plurality of servlets running on the server to provide data encryption (Salo '800: col. 12, ln. 50 to col. 13, ln. 14).
- (Claim 17) wherein the server is accessible by one or more client computers coupled to the server (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 49-61 – note that a web server implies multiple web clients).
- (Claim 19) wherein the database further comprises a detect view operable to receive a search query and return information associated with the data retrieved by the search request (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 55-60; p. 30, col. 2, lns. 17-49 - note Link analysis reads on a detect view).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the data center of Salo '800 to the FAIS system of Senator '95. The motivation to combine is on the same basis as Claim 7 (supra).

Claims 18 and 21:

Regarding Claim 18 and 21, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose all the limitations of Claim 17 (supra). Additionally, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose:

- (Claim 18) wherein each of the one or more client computers are running a web browser (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 49-61 – note that a web server implies clients with web browsers).
- (Claim 21) wherein the one or more clients are coupled to the server via a connection over the Internet (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 49-61 – note that a web server implies multiple web clients).

Claim 24:

Regarding Claim 24, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 23 (supra). However, Senator '95 does not disclose wherein the format file is an XML file.

Salo '800 discloses an XML format file (Salo '800: col. 7, lns. 19-25).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the data center of Salo '800 to the FAIS system of Senator '95. The motivation to combine is on the same basis as Claim 7 (supra).

Claim 25:

Regarding Claim 25, Senator '95 discloses: a method for retrieving law enforcement data from one or more law enforcement databases comprising:

Art Unit: 2171

- accessing a law enforcement search site (Senator '95: p. 27 col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface");
- receiving search requests at the law enforcement search site as user input to a search form (Senator '95: p. 27 col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface");
- forming a database query from the search request at a server (Senator '95: p. 27 col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface");
- querying a law enforcement database using the database query (Senator '95: p. 27 col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface"), the law enforcement database formed by migrating data from one or more pre-existing legacy law enforcement databases (Senator '95: p. 21, col. 2. lns. 2-5; p. 26, col. 26, lns. 11-27 - note data feeds from banks read on migrating data from one or more legacy databases; additionally note the data-load programs consolidate subjects and accounts).

However, Senator '95 does not explicitly disclose the client is using a web browser.

Salo '800 discloses a data center for providing subscriber access to data maintained on an enterprise network. Specifically, Salo '800 discloses hosting on an Internet accessible data center which implies clients with web browsers (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 47-61).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the data center of Salo '800 to the FAIS system of Senator '95. The motivation to combine is on the same basis as Claim 7 (supra).

Claim 27:

Regarding Claim 27, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose all the limitations of Claim 25 (supra). Additionally, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose: wherein the step of receiving a search request comprises receiving a search request to search for data contained in the search request as well as data associated with the data retrieved by the search request (Senator '95: p. 27 col. 2 to p.29, col. 1 (p. 28 is an illustration), Section titled, "Interactive Query Interface" ; p. 26, col. 2, ln. 50 to p. 27, col. 2, ln. 9 – note that when a query is executed searching on data clusters, it retrieves all the data in the association, not just the data in the specific search request).

Claim 28:

Regarding Claim 28, Senator '95 discloses: a system for searching a police database comprising:

- a police database coupled to a server (Senator '95; Abstract);
- the police database formed by migrating information from one or more legacy databases (Senator '95: p. 21, col. 2. lns. 2-5; p. 26, col. 26, lns. 11-27 - note data feeds from banks read on migrating data from one or more legacy databases; additionally note the data-load programs consolidate subjects and accounts) using a migration tool to format information in legacy database for use in the police database (Senator '95: p. 30, col. 2, ln. 50 to p. 31, col. 1, ln. 12 - note that the database is separated from other application modules, including the loader i.e. the loader reads on a migration server).

However, Senator '95 does not explicitly disclose:

- a client computer operable to run a web browser;

- a server computer coupled to the client computer, the server running a web server operable to send and receive search pages from the client computer.

Salo '800 discloses:

- a client computer operable to run a web browser (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 49-61 – note that a web server implies clients with web browsers);
- a server computer coupled to the client computer, the server running a web server operable to send and receive search pages from the client computer (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 47-61).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the data center of Salo '800 to the FAIS system of Senator '95. The motivation to combine is on the same basis as Claim 7 (*supra*).

Claim 29:

Regarding Claim 29, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose all the limitations of Claim 28 (*supra*). Additionally, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose wherein the police database comprises a detect view for searching for data related to a search term (Salo '800: col. 5, lns. 55-60; p. 30, col. 2, lns. 17-49 - note Link analysis reads on a detect view).

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Senator '95 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,350 issued to Steen et al. (hereafter Steen '350).

Claim 26:

Regarding Claim 26, Senator '95 discloses all the limitations of Claim 25 (supra). Additionally, Senator '95 discloses: further comprising the step of updating the law enforcement database when information is added to the one or more preexisting legacy law enforcement databases (Senator '95: p. 25, col. 1, lns. 5-26). However, Senator '95 does not disclose that the update is automatic.

Steen '350 discloses a means of remote data access and system control. Specifically, Steen '350 discloses automatic remote data update (Steen '350: col. 2, lns. 37-45).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the automatic update of Steen '350 to the FAIS system of Senator '95. The motivation to combine is suggested by Steen '350 which discloses that application of the Steen '350 invention provides a particularly cost effective and secure means of remote data update to database systems such as the FAIS of Senator '95 (Steen '350: col. 1, lns. 20-37)

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Senator '95 and Salo '800 in view of Steen '350.

Claim 30:

Regarding Claim 30, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose all the limitations of Claim 28 (supra). Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination disclose wherein the police database is updated when data is added to the one or more legacy databases (Senator '95: p. 25, col. 1, lns. 5-26). However, Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination do not explicitly disclose that the update is automatic.

Steen '350 discloses a means of remote data access and system control. Specifically, Steen '350 discloses automatic remote data update (Steen '350: col. 2, lns. 37-45).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the automatic update of Steen '350 to the system of Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination. The motivation to combine is suggested by Steen '350 which discloses that application of the Steen '350 invention provides a particularly cost effective and secure means of remote data update to database systems such as the system of Senator '95 and Salo '800 in combination (Steen '350: col. 1, lns. 20-37)

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- U.S. Patent No. 5,956,717, issued to Kraay et al., "Database Origami." Reference discloses a law enforcement database with consolidation, link analysis, internet access, and the like. The title refers to the product name.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick J.D. Santos whose telephone number is 703-305-0707. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patrick J.D. Santos
July 2, 2004



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100